

REMARKS

Claims 6-10 and 14 have been canceled. Claims 2-5 and 11-13, and amended claim 1 are in this application.

Claims 1-3 and 11-12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,545,709 B2 (Takei et al.) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,720,866 B1 (Sorrells et al.). Claim 4 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Takei in view of Sorrells and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,408,095 B1 (Maeda et al.) and U.S. Patent No. 6,6863,829 B1 (Hohberger et al.). Claim 5 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Takei in view of Sorrells and further in view of Maeda. Claim 13 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Takei in view of Sorrells and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,122,329 (Zai et al.). Claim 14 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Takei in view of Sorrells and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,315,522 B2 (Wood, Jr.).

Independent claim 1 has been amended herein so as to include features similar to or somewhat similar to those of claim 14 along with other features. As a result, amended independent claim 1 now recites in part the following:

"in which the wireless communication system includes a circuit to provide confirmation as to whether the image data supplied from the data supply source apparatus is correct or incorrect, and

in which an average power utilized by the wireless communication system for transmission of the image data and the confirmation thereof is 10 mW (milliwatts) or less." (Emphasis added.)

Initially, it is respectfully submitted that the present application provides support for the features herein added to claim 1. With regard thereto and as an example, reference is made to paragraphs 0028 and 0047 of the present application.

In explaining the above 103 rejection with regard to claim 14 and as best understood, the Examiner appears to rely on Wood (and in particular lines 31-46 of column 10 and Fig. 5 thereof) for disclosing a circuit to provide confirmation. (See section 7 on page 12 of the present Office Action.)

Although the portions of Wood relied on by the Examiner appear to mention acknowledging a receipt or returning a negative acknowledgment, such portions do not appear to disclose all of the above-identified features now recited in claim 1. For example, such portions of Wood do not appear to disclose "in which an average power utilized by the wireless communication system for transmission of the image data and the confirmation thereof is 10 mW (milliwatts) or less." (Emphasis added.)

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that amended claim 1 is distinguishable from the applied combinations of references.

Claims 2-5 and 11-13 are dependent from amended independent claim 1. Accordingly, it is also respectfully submitted that dependent claims 2-5 and 11-13 are distinguishable from the applied combinations of references for at least the reasons previously described.

As it is believed that all of the rejections set forth in the Official Action have been overcome, favorable reconsideration and allowance are earnestly solicited. If, however, for any reason the Examiner does not believe that such action can be taken at this time, it is respectfully requested

Application No.: 10/567,622

Docket No.: SONYJP 3.3-401

that the Examiner telephone applicant's attorney at (908) 654-5000 in order to overcome any additional rejections and/or objections which the Examiner might have.

If there are any charges in connection with this requested amendment, the Examiner is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 12-1095 therefor.

Dated: June 28, 2010

Respectfully submitted,
Electronic signature: /Dennis M.
Smid, Esq./
Dennis M. Smid, Esq.
Registration No.: 34,930
LERNER, DAVID, LITTENBERG,
KRUMHOLZ & MENTLIK, LLP
600 South Avenue West
Westfield, New Jersey 07090
(908) 654-5000
Attorney for Applicant